



Student: **Michael Higley-Vance**

THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETELY FILLED IN

Follow these procedures: If requested by your instructor, please include an assignment cover sheet. This will become the first page of your assignment. In addition, your assignment header should include your last name, first initial, course code, dash, and assignment number. This should be left justified, with the page number right justified. For example:

DoeJXXX0000-1	1
---------------	---

Save a copy of your assignments: You may need to re-submit an assignment at your instructor's request. Make sure you save your files in accessible location.

Academic integrity: All work submitted in each course must be your own original work. This includes all assignments, exams, term papers, and other projects required by your instructor. Knowingly submitting another person's work as your own, without properly citing the source of the work, is considered plagiarism. This will result in an unsatisfactory grade for the work submitted or for the entire course. It may also result in academic dismissal from the University.

EDU7702-8

Dr. Mark Kelso

Online Learning Communities

Activity #2: Validity in e-Learning

Comments:

Faculty Use Only

<Faculty comments here>

Hi Michael,

Outstanding job on the assignment. Very well written and presented. Outstanding APA formatting. This assignment was important as you will be addressing validity throughout your Doctoral journey, especially in your milestone documents. I did notice a few small writing issues

below. I highly recommend that you perform a thorough proof read of your papers. In addition, you made a very powerful statement without a source. Please be sure to use sources on your major points.

This assignment called for you to write a paper in which you compare and contrast the characteristics of external, internal, and construct validity. You were also asked to identify the threats to external and construct validity and discuss how validity issues could impact your envisioned research. You definitely met the assignment guidelines. In the next assignment, you will be doing your CITI certification and we have already discussed which CITI you will take. Your score is 9.8. Please let me know if you have any questions. Hope you have a great week!

Mark

Please see the Turnitin report. Your score of 49% is way too high. No worries, I know that you did not commit plagiarism...you had sources.

<Faculty Name>Kelso <Grade Earned>9.8 <Writing Score>2.8 <Date Graded>4/18/14

Validity: Construct, Internal, External, & Conclusion

The **term**, blended learning, which combines face-to-face and online learning, has been discussed by experts as a favorable alternative to traditional only classroom instruction (So & Bonk, 2010). Although blended learning approaches to education are becoming widely accepted and implemented, there is still research to be conducted in support of current learning theory and the partnering of technology. Even more research is lacking addressing **he** effects of technology use in education on student discipline. This paper aims to address the term validity in direct relation to research and its importance to the proposed research topic.

Validity refers to the accurate representation of information found in research. There are four types of validity, which are described using the following terms: construct, internal, external, and conclusion validity (Cozby, 2009; Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). Each validity type gives researchers a different perspective in which to view particular research topics and investigations. The process of research informs on the implementation of theoretical concepts and the application of theory (Burchett, Umoquit, & Dobrow, 2011; Tolutiene & Domarkiene, 2010). Only through research can theory be developed, tested, and **advanced**. Research broadens and strengthens theoretical ideas, but only if it is based on verity (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). Ultimately, only through valid research can the acceptance or rejection of a theory be justified. According to Trochim and Donnelly (2008) the foundation of verity in research is

validity. Research validity asks researchers to answer three key questions about their research:

(1) does the variable accurately represent the concept or truth that is being pursued, **(2)** how strongly can a causal relationship be established between two variables, and **(3)** how well do the results convey universal truth that is fully generalizable (Cozby, 2009)? Individual scholars label

the concepts differently, but the underlying systems and concepts are similar. Excellent content!

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:56 AM

Comment [1]: It is not so much a term, but an instructional method...right?

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:56 AM

Comment [2]: Missing t

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:16 AM

Comment [3]: This is a good place where you needed a source.

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:00 AM

Comment [4]: In your papers, you will have to utilize sources that are over 5 years old. As long as you have at least 80% of your sources within the last 5 years you will be fine.

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:58 AM

Deleted: ;

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:58 AM

Deleted: a

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:58 AM

Deleted: b

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:58 AM

Deleted: c

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 6:59 AM

Comment [5]: ???

Construct Validity

The most important type of validity and hardest to identify is construct validity (Johnston et al., 2014). Leedy and Ormrod (2010) stated that construct validity is the “extent to which an instrument measures a characteristic that cannot be directly observed but is assumed to exist based on patterns in people’s behavior” (p. 92). Cozby (2009) indicated that construct validity is focused on the research variables being tested and “the adequacy of the operational definition of variables” (p. 85). Meltzoff (1998) stated that the focus of construct validity is on the results and the extent that those results relate to a fundamental psychological construct. In research studies involving theoretical constructs, it is important that measures have good content validity (Johnston et al., 2014). The common ideal for construct validity is how closely the research investigates what is being tested. [Also excellent content.](#)

Threats to construct validity. The greatest threat to construct validity is inexperience in implementing research (Cresswell, 2009). Johnston et al. (2014) states that construct validity needs to be established within the suggested theory before testing [should begin](#). A construct [\(what\)](#) is inadequately defined when its essential components have not been clearly thought out (Lund Research Ltd., 2012), no exact or operational definition can be determined or provided (Cresswell, 2009), and insufficient information has been provided to explain its content (Johnston et al., 2014; Lund Research Ltd., 2012). [If construct validity is missing in research nothing else matters.](#) For example, if a researcher believes that he or she is measuring learner interest but is instead measuring learner participation, the research lacks validity because it is not evaluating the construct that it purports to analyze. [To address this threat, it is necessary to enlist the help and input of content experts and experienced researchers \(Trochim, 2006\).](#) Use of experts is essential to formulating strong construct validity (So & Bonk, 2010). [Very true.](#)

mkello@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:01 AM
Comment [6]: begins

mkello@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:02 AM
Comment [7]: OK. I see what you are saying here.

mkello@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:30 AM
Comment [8]: This section comes up as plagiarized from another student at NCU. I am thinking that this may have been paraphrased.

Impact and threats on envisioned research. I envision in my research to investigate whether a blended technology use has an impact on student discipline in the traditional classroom environment. The independent variable of using or not using technology is easily defined and thus has construct validity. The concepts of learner interest and perceived student learning however, are not so easily quantified since they cannot be heard or seen. To measure learner interest or perceived learning it is essential to have an instrument that will accurately represent and depict differences in and between these concepts. The Learner Satisfaction, Mitchel SI scale, and Transfer-of-learning Questionnaire (LSTQ) were developed by researchers to address this need (Gunawardena, Linder-VanBerschot, LaPointe, & Rao, 2010; Linnenbrink-Garcia et al., 2010). [OK](#)

Internal Validity

A leading influence in research is to seek answers to questions regarding what causes what to happen (Trochim, 2006). When evaluating a claim that an outcome is caused by, the basis of the analysis should be grounded in internal validity (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). Internal validity refers to the ability of the researcher to draw inferences about casual relationships from data (Crozby, 2009). Additionally, Crozby (2009) states that internal validity is increased when cause and effect actions are considered and applied to the research.

Impact and threats on envisioned research. Random assignment of subjects to groups affords the strongest possibility of establishing a causal relationship, while a nonrandomized assignment provides the weakest internal validity (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). In my research I expect to use a [Regression Discontinuity Design \(RDD\)](#) because it will help determine whether using technology to impact student discipline is effective. Unlike many other research designs, the experimental group in regression-discontinuity requires that learners will be assigned to the

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:04 AM

Comment [9]: I am still not clear on how you will do this, but this is only the second course and I will get better idea of where you are going later on in the course.

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:04 AM

Comment [10]: For future reference. Do not include this source in your CP, DP, or DM.

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:05 AM

Deleted: r

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:05 AM

Deleted: -

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:05 AM

Deleted: d

mkkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:05 AM

Deleted: d

blended education program based on a pre-determined amount of discipline points earned during the prior school year. The control group will consist of learners who do not currently meet the established discipline point criterion and who have no history of discipline concerns. With an established criterion applied to one control and one experimental group, within the traditional school environment, reasonable internal validity can be expected. Furthermore, internal validity may be increased using the control group results for statistical manipulation to approximate randomization effects (Wright, 2006). [Here is a question for you to think about...will you be able to obtain permission to conduct the study? Be sure to find out.](#)

External Validity

According to Crozby (2009) external validity attempts to apply operational definitions of the variables to a variety of settings and situations. The role of external validity determines whether or not an observed casual relationship of a study should be generalized to other populations, measures, and settings (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008; Calder, Phillips, & Tybout, 1982). The effects of chance, imperfect conceptualizations, and deficient understanding of associations makes determining the generalizability and external validity extremely unlikely (Crozby, 2009; Lynch, 1983). Calder, Phillips, and Tybout (1982) postulate, “external validity may be sacrificed in favor of addressing threats to internal and construct validity” (p. 240). However, considering external validity to be unimportant can prevent researchers from thinking critically about how variables might alter the effects of theoretical variables (Lynch, 1983). [OK](#)

Threats to external validity. In addition to identifying appropriate external validity researchers must also consider the potential threats (Cresswell, 2009). Crozby (2009) states that internal validity may conflict with external validity without the use of field experiments

supported within the study. According to Calder, Phillips, and Tybout (1982) “construct validity is necessary but not sufficient condition for external validity (p. 242). Additionally, any incorrect inference regarding the application of a studies finding applied to an incorrect population or sub group weakens external validity (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). External validity can never be guaranteed because the variables are too great to anticipate and control. However, with continued research and “improvement of both theory and external validity remains a worthy goal” (Lynch, 1983, p. 111).

Threats to external validity arise when findings overstep subject traits, geographical diversity, or timeliness of the study, which weakens the validity of the findings (Creswell, 2009). For example, if all of the subjects of a study were males between the ages of 10-14 it is inappropriate to make inferences regarding males between the ages of 15-18. If a relationship study is conducted exclusively at a public high school it is unsuitable to make inferences regarding relationships with a private elementary school. Finally, if a study focuses on digital natives of the 21st century classroom it is inappropriate to make inferences about their grandparents in the early 20th century classroom. [Excellent content.](#)

Impact of external validity and threats on envisioned research. The prospective subjects for [the proposed](#) research [study](#) are middle school learners between the ages of 12 and 14 years, who are of mixed gender, and technical background. Qualifying subjects are only participating in the blended learning classroom during the normal school day of 7 am to 2:30 pm. Extending the findings of my study to other blended learning environments across other grade and age groups seems feasible. Another consideration regarding my envisioned study is that the data collected will be done over a period of nine school months and it is possible that subjects who enroll throughout the school year, from varying locations and school districts, have vastly

mkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:07 AM
Deleted: &

mkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:08 AM
Comment [11]: This is one of these times that you need to use an out dated source.

mkelso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:09 AM
Deleted: my

different behavioral characteristics or documented discipline points than those of currently enrolled subjects.

Conclusion Validity

Of the four types of validity, conclusion validity is the least considered and most misunderstood (Trochim, 2006). Conclusion validity, also referred to as statistical conclusion validity, is the degree to which conclusions are reached about reasonable relationships from observed and collected from data. According to García-Pérez (2012) statistical conclusion validity holds true when the conclusions of a study “are founded on an adequate analysis of the data...” (p. 1). When researchers compare and contrast a relationship, essentially there are two potentially possible conclusions; a relationship exists or that one does not. In either case, the threat to conclusion validity is that research conclusions and interpretations of the data could still potentially exist among the findings (Cresswell, 2009). For example, researchers might conclude that there is a relationship between female and male behaviors during a particular time of day when in fact there is not, or infer that there is no relationship when one does exist. In many circumstances, conclusion validity is the most important of the four validity types because it is relevant when deciding if there is a relationship within personal observations (García-Pérez, 2012; Trochim, 2006), which is one of the basic components of my envisioned study. [OK](#)

Conclusion

Valid research consists of four dimensions of truth: construct, internal, external, and conclusion validity. Construct validity is absolutely essential and the hardest to identify (Johnston et al., 2014; Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The basis of an analysis, when resulting from a claim, is grounded in internal validity. Additionally, external validity determines whether or not an observed casual relationship of a study should be applied to other populations, geographical

locations, or settings. The closer variables reflect the truth the more likely research findings will reflect and approach truth. Besides construct validity, other validity types exist within a range, and according to the literature have a negative correlation (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008).

Furthermore, as the internal validity of a study increases the external validity tends to decrease making it less expandable (Crozby, 2009). Just as equally important, the greater the generalizability the less likely a study will formulate a causal relationship (Crozby, 2009; Lynch, 1983). However, all validity types are necessary and must be considered while designing a research study. Valid research, based on universal truth, only serves to further and strengthen theory and application (Burchett, Umoquit, & Dobrow, 2011; Tolutiene & Domarkiene, 2010; Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). [Well done Michael!](#)

References

- Burchett, H., Umoquit, M., & Dobrow, M. (2011). How do we know when research from one setting can be useful in another? A review of external validity, applicability and transferability frameworks. *Journal Of Health Services Research & Policy*, 16(4), pp. 238-244. doi:10.1258/jhsrp.2011.010124
- Calder, B. J., Phillips, L. W., & Tybout, A. M. (1982). The Concept of External Validity. *Journal Of Consumer Research*, 9(3), pp. 240-244. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.ncu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=4658488&site=eds-live>
- Cozby, P. C., (2009). *Methods in behavioral research* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- García-Pérez, M. (2012). Statistical conclusion validity: Some common threats and simple remedies. *Frontiers In Psychology*, 3(325), pp. 1-11. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00325
- Gunawardena, C. N., Linder-VanBerschoot, J. A., LaPointe, D. K., & Rao, L. (2010). Predictors of learner satisfaction and transfer of learning in a corporate online education program. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 24(1), pp. 207-226. doi:10.1080/08923647.2010.522919
- Johnston, M., Dixon, D., Hart, J., Glidewell, L., Schröder, C., & Pollard, B. (2014). Discriminant content validity: A quantitative methodology for assessing content of theory-based measures, with illustrative applications. *British Journal Of Health Psychology*, 19(2), pp. 240-257. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.ncu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=95561874&site=eds-live>
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., Durik, A. M., Conley, A. M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J. M., Karabenick, S. A., & Harckiewicz, J. M. (2010). Measuring situational interest in academic domains. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, pp. 1-25. doi:10.1177/0013164409355699
- Lund Research Ltd. (2012). Laerd dissertation. [web site]. Retrieved from <http://dissertation.laerd.com/construct-validity-p2.php#threat1>
- Lynch Jr., J. G. (1983). The Role of External Validity in Theoretical Research. *Journal Of Consumer Research*, 10(1), pp. 109-111. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.ncu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=4661913&site=eds-live>

mkelloso@my.ncu.edu 5/18/14 7:13 AM

Comment [12]: These are perfect. Thank you for your high level of attention to detail!

- Meltzoff, J. (1998). *Critical thinking about research: Psychology and related fields*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- So, H., & Bonk, C. J. (2010). Examining the roles of blended learning approaches in computer-supported collaborative learning (cscl) environments: A delphi study. *Journal Of Educational Technology & Society*, 13(3), pp. 189-200. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.ncu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ofs&AN=508132045&site=eds-live>
- Tolutiene, G. & Domarkiene, J. (2010). Learning needs and the possibilities of their satisfaction: The case of prospective andragogues. *Bridges / Tiltai*, 50(1), pp. 147-158. Retrieved from <http://proxy1.ncu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ehh&AN=50744788&site=eds-live>
- Trochim, W. (2006). Research methods knowledge base. [web site]. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/index.php>
- Trochim, W. M. K., & Donnelly, J. P. (2008). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Wright, D. B. (2006). Comparing groups in a before-after design: When *t* test and ANCOVA produce different results. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 663-675. doi:10.1348/000709905X52210